UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,378	05/22/2006	Juha Iso-Sipila	857.0052.U1(US)	2561

29683   7590   12/24/2008
HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC
4 RESEARCH DRIVE, Suite 202
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212

EXAMINER
COLUCCI, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-18_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-18_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _22 May 2006_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claim 1 objected to because of the following informalities: The language "in which packages (LP1 – LP9) several languages (L1 – L34) are grouped". Examiner construes this to be read as "*in which several languages (L1 – L34) are grouped".* Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   Regarding claims 1 and 9, the phrase "for example" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. Further, phrases recited: "a possible", "may belong", "can belong", and "there can be" are also indefinite for the same reasons. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because:

The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 16-18 claim a "computer program" which does not fall under one of the statutory categories under 35 USC 101 as patent eligible subject matter, where a computer program or computer program product does not define any structural and

functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements

of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

King US 6532446 B1 (hereinafter King) in view of Van Gestel US 6963836 B2

(hereinafter Van Gestel).

Re claims 1 9, and 16, King teaches an electronic device , which includes

- a voice user interface (VUI) and a possible terminal user interface (TUI) for

controlling the functions of the device (Col. 5 lines 33-47),

- speech-recognition devices (SR) for implementing the voice user interface (VUI)

(Col. 5 lines 33-47), and

- memory (MEM), in which language-configuration data is arranged for the user

interface (VUI, UI), including several language packages (LP1 - LP9), in which

packages (LP1 - LP9) several languages (L1 - L34) are grouped, at least some of which

languages (L1 - L34) may belong to several language packages (LP1 - LP9) and of

which language packages (LP1 - LP9) at least one (LP1) is arranged to be selected for

use in the user interface (VUI, UI), characterized in that the device is arranged to

register at least a first language (LI/L6) for at least one user interface (VUI, UI), on the

basis of which language information (LI/L6) the device is arranged to perform a

selection of the language package (LPI/LP2) and, in order to perform which selection,

information on the languages (L1 - L34) belonging to each language package (LP1 -

LP9) is arranged in the device (Col. 5 lines 33-47)

However, Van Gestel fails to teach a device arranged to perform a selection of

language packages

Van Gestel teaches that language selection as a side-effect of a spoken

command makes the method very user friendly and attractive for incorporation in

electronic systems and products sold in different countries or regions using different

languages or dialects as well as for application in bi- or multilingual areas or in multi-

user environments, where users may be expected to operate the system in a number of

different languages, ranging from a private household having members with different

native language to a public multi-user installation such as an information boot or kiosk,

especially in a place with many tourists or visitors (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Further, Van Gestel teaches that the word "language" may comprise any natural

or artificial language, as well as any dialect version of a language, terminology or slang.

The number of language options to be offered by the method may, depending on the

actual electronic device with which the method is to be used, vary within wide limits, e.g.

in the range from 2 to 100 language options. For commercial products marketed on a

global basis, the language options would typically include a number of major languages

such as English, Spanish, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, Japanese,

Chinese etc. (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 53-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify the system of King to incorporate a device arranged to

perform a selection of language packages as taught by Van Gestel to allow for the

selection of one specific language as well as any variants of that language such as the

case of a different dialect, wherein a more uer friendly environment is realized

especially in diverse areas where several languages and dialects are present (Van

Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Re claim 2, King teaches a device (-1-8-) according to Claim 1, characterized in

that, if the selected first language (L6) belongs to at least two language packages (LP1 -

LP7), the device (-1-8) is arranged to register in addition a second language (L11) (Col.

5 lines 33-47) for a second user interface (UI/VUI), on the basis of which first and

second language information (L6, L11) the device is arranged to select the language

package (LP2) (Col. 7 lines 45-55 & Fig. 1 and 2).

However, Van Gestel fails to teach a device arranged to perform a selection of

language packages

Van Gestel teaches that language selection as a side-effect of a spoken

command makes the method very user friendly and attractive for incorporation in

electronic systems and products sold in different countries or regions using different

languages or dialects as well as for application in bi- or multilingual areas or in multi-

user environments, where users may be expected to operate the system in a number of different languages, ranging from a private household having members with different native language to a public multi-user installation such as an information boot or kiosk, especially in a place with many tourists or visitors (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Further, Van Gestel teaches that the word "language" may comprise any natural or artificial language, as well as any dialect version of a language, terminology or slang. The number of language options to be offered by the method may, depending on the actual electronic device with which the method is to be used, vary within wide limits, e.g. in the range from 2 to 100 language options. For commercial products marketed on a global basis, the language options would typically include a number of major languages such as English, Spanish, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, Japanese, Chinese etc. (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 53-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of King to incorporate a device arranged to perform a selection of language packages as taught by Van Gestel to allow for the selection of one specific language as well as any variants of that language such as the case of a different dialect, wherein a more uer friendly environment is realized especially in diverse areas where several languages and dialects are present (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Re claims 3 and 12, King fails to teach a device (-1-8-) according to Claim 1, characterized in that a native-language package is set for each language (L1 - L34).

Van Gestel teaches that language selection as a side-effect of a spoken

command makes the method very user friendly and attractive for incorporation in

electronic systems and products sold in different countries or regions using different

languages or dialects as well as for application in bi- or multilingual areas or in multi-

user environments, where users may be expected to operate the system in a number of

different languages, ranging from a private household having members with different

native language to a public multi-user installation such as an information boot or kiosk,

especially in a place with many tourists or visitors (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify the system of King to incorporate a native-language

package is set for each language as taught by Van Gestel to allow for the selection of

one specific language native a user as well as any variants of that language such as the

case of a different dialect, wherein a more user friendly environment is realized

especially in diverse areas where several languages and dialects are present (Van

Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Re claims 4 and 14, King teaches a device (-1-8) according to Claims 1,

characterized in that the said first language (LI/L6) is the voice-user-interface language

(VUIL) (Col. 5 lines 33-47).

Re claim 5, King teaches a device (-1-8) according to Claims 1, characterized in

that the said second language (L11) is the user-interface language (UIL) (Col. 5 lines

33-47).

However, Van Gestel fails to teach a device arranged to perform a selection of

language packages

Van Gestel teaches that language selection as a side-effect of a spoken

command makes the method very user friendly and attractive for incorporation in

electronic systems and products sold in different countries or regions using different

languages or dialects as well as for application in bi- or multilingual areas or in multi-

user environments, where users may be expected to operate the system in a number of

different languages, ranging from a private household having members with different

native language to a public multi-user installation such as an information boot or kiosk,

especially in a place with many tourists or visitors (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Further, Van Gestel teaches that the word "language" may comprise any natural

or artificial language, as well as any dialect version of a language, terminology or slang.

The number of language options to be offered by the method may, depending on the

actual electronic device with which the method is to be used, vary within wide limits, e.g.

in the range from 2 to 100 language options. For commercial products marketed on a

global basis, the language options would typically include a number of major languages

such as English, Spanish, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, Japanese,

Chinese etc. (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 53-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify the system of King to incorporate the said second

language being the user-interface language as taught by Van Gestel to allow for the

selection of one specific language as well as any variants of that language such as the

case of a different dialect, wherein a more uer friendly environment is realized

especially in diverse areas where several languages and dialects are present (Van

Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Re claims 6, 13, and 18, King teaches a device according to claim 1,

characterized in that the information, arranged in the memory (MEM) of the device on

the languages (L1 - L34) belonging to each language package (LP1 - LP9), is arranged

to form a look-up table (Col. 7 lines 28-44), from which look-up table the selection of the

language package (LP3) is arranged to be performed (Col. 5 lines 33-47).

However, Van Gestel fails to teach a device arranged to perform a selection of

language packages

Van Gestel teaches that language selection as a side-effect of a spoken

command makes the method very user friendly and attractive for incorporation in

electronic systems and products sold in different countries or regions using different

languages or dialects as well as for application in bi- or multilingual areas or in multi-

user environments, where users may be expected to operate the system in a number of

different languages, ranging from a private household having members with different

native language to a public multi-user installation such as an information boot or kiosk, especially in a place with many tourists or visitors (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Further, Van Gestel teaches that the word "language" may comprise any natural or artificial language, as well as any dialect version of a language, terminology or slang. The number of language options to be offered by the method may, depending on the actual electronic device with which the method is to be used, vary within wide limits, e.g. in the range from 2 to 100 language options. For commercial products marketed on a global basis, the language options would typically include a number of major languages such as English, Spanish, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, Japanese, Chinese etc. (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 53-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of King to incorporate a device arranged to perform a selection of language packages as taught by Van Gestel to allow for the selection of one specific language as well as any variants of that language such as the case of a different dialect, wherein a more uer friendly environment is realized especially in diverse areas where several languages and dialects are present (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Re claim 7, King teaches a device according to Claim 6, characterized in that voice-user-interface language user-interface language combinations (VUIL-UIL) are arranged in the look-up table (Col. 7 lines 28-44), to each of which combinations (VUIL-

UIL) a language package (LP1 - LP9), suitable for selection, is linked (Col. 5 lines 33-47).

Re claim 8, King teaches a device according to claims 1, characterized in that the device is a mobile station (Col. 5 lines 33-47).

Re claim 10, King teaches a method according to Claim 9, characterized in that, in the method

- at least a first language (LI/L6) is registered as language information in the device (--1-8-) for one user interface (VUI, UI) (Col. 7 lines 45-55 & Fig. 1 and 2)

- if the said first language (L1) belongs to a single language package (LP1) the device selects the language package (LP1) on the basis of the first language (L1) (Col. 5 lines 33-47)

However, Van Gestel fails to teach a device arranged to perform a selection of language packages

Van Gestel teaches that language selection as a side-effect of a spoken command makes the method very user friendly and attractive for incorporation in electronic systems and products sold in different countries or regions using different languages or dialects as well as for application in bi- or multilingual areas or in multi-user environments, where users may be expected to operate the system in a number of different languages, ranging from a private household having members with different

native language to a public multi-user installation such as an information boot or kiosk,

especially in a place with many tourists or visitors (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Further, Van Gestel teaches that the word "language" may comprise any natural

or artificial language, as well as any dialect version of a language, terminology or slang.

The number of language options to be offered by the method may, depending on the

actual electronic device with which the method is to be used, vary within wide limits, e.g.

in the range from 2 to 100 language options. For commercial products marketed on a

global basis, the language options would typically include a number of major languages

such as English, Spanish, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, Japanese,

Chinese etc. (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 53-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify the system of King to incorporate a device arranged to

perform a selection of language packages as taught by Van Gestel to allow for the

selection of one specific language as well as any variants of that language such as the

case of a different dialect, wherein a more uer friendly environment is realized

especially in diverse areas where several languages and dialects are present (Van

Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Re claim 11, King teaches a method according to Claim 10, characterized in that,

if the selected first language (L6) (Col. 5 lines 33-47) belongs to several language

packages (LP1 - LP7), additionally in the method

- a second language (L11) is registered in the device (10) for a second user interface (UI, VUI) (Col. 7 lines 45-55 & Fig. 1 and 2)

- the device selects the language package (LP2) on the basis of the first and second languages (L6, L11) (Col. 5 lines 33-47)

However, Van Gestel fails to teach a device arranged to perform a selection of language packages

Van Gestel teaches that language selection as a side-effect of a spoken command makes the method very user friendly and attractive for incorporation in electronic systems and products sold in different countries or regions using different languages or dialects as well as for application in bi- or multilingual areas or in multi-user environments, where users may be expected to operate the system in a number of different languages, ranging from a private household having members with different native language to a public multi-user installation such as an information boot or kiosk, especially in a place with many tourists or visitors (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Further, Van Gestel teaches that the word "language" may comprise any natural or artificial language, as well as any dialect version of a language, terminology or slang. The number of language options to be offered by the method may, depending on the actual electronic device with which the method is to be used, vary within wide limits, e.g. in the range from 2 to 100 language options. For commercial products marketed on a global basis, the language options would typically include a number of major languages such as English, Spanish, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, Japanese, Chinese etc. (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 53-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of King to incorporate a device arranged to perform a selection of language packages as taught by Van Gestel to allow for the selection of one specific language as well as any variants of that language such as the case of a different dialect, wherein a more uer friendly environment is realized especially in diverse areas where several languages and dialects are present (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Re claim 15, King teaches method according to Claim 9, characterized in that the said second language (L11) is the user-interface language (UIL) (Col. 5 lines 33-47).

Re claim 17, King teaches a computer program according to Claim 16, characterized in that the program is arranged

- to investigate the number of language packages (LP1 - LP9) linked to the first language information. (L6), on the basis of which the program is arranged to additionally register the language information (L11) of a second language (UIL) (Col. 5 lines 33-47)

- to select the language package (LP2) to be used in the device, on the basis of the said first and second language information (L6, L11), from the said language-language package information (-1-8) arranged in the device (Col. 5 lines 33-47)

However, Van Gestel fails to teach a device arranged to perform a selection of language packages

Van Gestel teaches that language selection as a side-effect of a spoken

command makes the method very user friendly and attractive for incorporation in

electronic systems and products sold in different countries or regions using different

languages or dialects as well as for application in bi- or multilingual areas or in multi-

user environments, where users may be expected to operate the system in a number of

different languages, ranging from a private household having members with different

native language to a public multi-user installation such as an information boot or kiosk,

especially in a place with many tourists or visitors (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Further, Van Gestel teaches that the word "language" may comprise any natural

or artificial language, as well as any dialect version of a language, terminology or slang.

The number of language options to be offered by the method may, depending on the

actual electronic device with which the method is to be used, vary within wide limits, e.g.

in the range from 2 to 100 language options. For commercial products marketed on a

global basis, the language options would typically include a number of major languages

such as English, Spanish, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, Japanese,

Chinese etc. (Van Gestel Col. 3 lines 53-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify the system of King to incorporate a device arranged to

perform a selection of language packages as taught by Van Gestel to allow for the

selection of one specific language as well as any variants of that language such as the

case of a different dialect, wherein a more uer friendly environment is realized

especially in diverse areas where several languages and dialects are present (Van

Gestel Col. 3 lines 10-21).

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. US 6941273 B1, US 7403888 B1, US 6385586 B1, US 6601029

B1.

       Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael C. Colucci whose telephone number is (571)-

270-1847. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6:00 pm, Monday-

Friday.

       If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)-272-7602. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael C Colucci/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626
Patent Examiner
AU 2626
(571)-270-1847
Michael.Colucci@uspto.gov

/Richemond Dorvil/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626